

08-15-06


PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE


Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

AF TW

TRANSMITTAL FORM  (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/774,275
	Filing Date	January 30, 2001
	First Named Inventor	Aaron Strand
	Art Unit	3727
	Examiner Name	Jes F. Pascua
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Attorney Docket Number	8362-CIP-DIV

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) ____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Postcard
Remarks		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm	Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren s.c.		
Signature			
Printed Name	Leslie S. Miller		
Date	August 14, 2006	Reg. No.	30,662

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express Mail No. <u>EV717266925US</u> in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.			
Signature			
Typed or printed name	Leslie S. Miller	Date	August 14, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

MW/1341343

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail No. EV717266766US with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 14, 2006.
Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren s.c.

PATENT APPLICATION

By: Leslie S. Miller
Leslie S. Miller

Date: August 14, 2006



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

GROUP ART UNIT: 3727

EXAMINER: JES F. PASCUA

In re application of: Aaron Strand,)
Karl L. Linck, Judy Fischer,)
Thomas Spaeth, and Jerry D. Kolbe)

Application No: 09/774,275)

Filed: January 30, 2001)

Attorney Docket No. 8362-CIP-)
DIV)

For: A RESEALABLE BAG FOR
FILLING WITH FOOD
PRODUCT(S) AND METHOD

Commissioner for Patents
MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

August 14, 2006

REPLY BRIEF

Sir:

Appellants, in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed June 15, 2006, and pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.41, hereby file this Reply Brief as part of the appeal on the above-referenced patent application.

Reply to the Examiner's Answer -- Introduction

While much of the Examiner's Answer is a word-for-word repetition of the April 22, 2005, Office Action, the Examiner has added some new arguments which were not focused upon in the April 22, 2005, Office Action. These arguments can be divided up into four sections: 1. very brief comments on the Examiner's mention of the Section 112, first paragraph, rejection; 2. very brief comments regarding the Examiner's use of official notice; 3. arguments regarding what is fairly taught by the Plourde '611 reference and how the mischaracterization of the Plourde '611 reference has been improperly used by the Examiner to justify the Section 103(a) combination rejections; and 4. arguments regarding the circumstances under which references may be combined in a rejection for which arguments are asserted by the Examiner to be based upon case law, but which arguments in fact are conclusory and are based upon hindsight, unsupported by the facts, and fail to make the findings explicitly required by the cited case law. These arguments will be addressed in the order mentioned above.

Observations and Arguments

I. **The Section 112, First Paragraph, Rejection.** The Examiner's Section 112, first paragraph, rejection of Claims 86 and 106 was and is erroneous. Appellants are required to teach one skilled in the art how to practice the invention as claimed. The areas of structural weakness which extend nonlinearly across a width dimension or a length dimension are in fact clearly shown in Fig. 5 (which is attached hereto as an Evidence

Appendix), and are described in the accompanying portion of the specification: "This embodiment includes score lines 12 laid out in an alternative pattern that includes curve or arcuate section 13. . . ." Thus, the score lines 12 are nonlinear in that they include the curve or arcuate sections 13 at each end thereof. One skilled in the art will readily and completely understand the subject matter of these claims, and, as such, the rejection of Claims 86 and 106, and of Claims 87, 88, 107, and 108, which are dependent thereupon, is incorrect.

II. The Examiner's Use of Official Notice. The Examiner's use of "official notice" as referred to in the last sentence of page 5 is alleged by the Examiner to relate to an admission of prior art by Appellants. This is simply incorrect, and the use of official notice by the Examiner is in fact little more than an explicit admission by the Examiner that he was unable to find a reference teaching part of Appellants' claims in the prior art. Instead of allowing the claims as is required by the law, the Examiner instead relied upon an incorrect assertion that is clearly in violation of proper procedure. "It would not be appropriate for the examiner to take official notice of facts without citing a prior art reference where the facts asserted to be well known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. ... It is never appropriate to rely solely on 'common knowledge' in the art without evidentiary support in the record, as the principal evidence upon which a rejection was based. In Re Zurko, 258 F.3d at 1385, 59 USPQ2d at 1697 ([T]he Board cannot simply reach conclusions based on its own

understanding or experience - or on its assessment of what would be basic knowledge or common sense. Rather, the Board must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings.')."

MPEP Section 2144.03.

III. The Examiner's Mischaracterization of the Plourde '611 Reference is an Erroneous Basis for Making Section 103(a) Combination Rejections. The Examiner bases the Section 103(a) combination rejections upon his assertion that the use of "the areas of structural weakness of Plourde '611, in order to provide a wider access to the interior of the bag" (page 4, lines 9-10) justifies combining the Plourde '611 reference with the Lingenfelter reference. In arguing this point, the Examiner states:

"[t]he difference in the width of the opening would be measured by the amount of bag material removed between the two lines of perforations 40, shown in cross-section in Fig. 4 of Plourde, as compared to no bag material removed by the single line of perforations as shown in Lingenfelter." Page 8, lines 17-20.

The Examiner has chosen to ignore a basic geometric fact (and not Appellants' opinion as erroneously asserted by the Examiner) that determines the maximum opening of any bag made of flexible material -- the maximum size of the opening in a bag made of flexible material is related only to the length of the opening and the flexibility of the outer side walls of the bag, and is not (and indeed cannot be) related to the size of flaps which comprise part of an inner seal contained in the bag. The single tearline 32 in the

Lingenfelter reference does not remove any material of the panels 19 and 21, but that is irrelevant since the panels 19 and 21 of the Lingenfelter reference are secured to the side walls of the bag 10. It is the length of the opening in the Lingenfelter bag 10 and the flexibility of the side walls of that bag 10 that determine the size of the opening in the Lingenfelter bag 10. Using an arc of material with two perforations 40 between the sides as an inner seal in the Plourde '611 bag 50 and removing the portion of the arc of material between the two perforations 40 does not (and indeed can not) increase the size of the opening in the Plourde '611 bag 50. The size of the opening in the Plourde '611 bag 50 is still limited by the length of the opening in the Plourde '611 bag 50 and the flexibility of the Plourde '611 bag 50.

The Examiner's bare assertion that he disagrees with Appellants' position does not make a basic geometric fact untrue. The use of the dual perforations 40 of the Plourde '611 reference in the Lingenfelter bag 10 would not and indeed could not increase the size of the opening in the Lingenfelter bag 10. In fact, the Plourde '611 construction would not be used by one skilled in the art to increase the size of the opening in the Lingenfelter bag 10 -- rather it would be avoided since it could make the size of the opening in the Lingenfelter bag 10 smaller rather than larger. In the Plourde '611 bag 50, after the material between the perforations 40 is removed (as shown in Fig. 4), the remaining portions of the sheet material 10 will likely flop toward each other, thereby actually narrowing the width of the opening. Since the panels 19 and 21 of the Lingenfelter bag

10 are attached to the sides of the Lingenfelter bag 10, they could not flop toward each other after the tearline 32 is torn. Accordingly, the Examiner's reason justifying the combination is clearly incorrect as a matter of basic geometry.

This is the only reason given either in the April 22, 2005, Office Action or in the Examiner's Answer to justify the combination. Since this reason is clearly incorrect, the combination of references is also incorrect. No one skilled in the art would use the Plourde '611 reference's construction with the Lingenfelter reference's device since the resulting combination has no benefit and quite possibly has a significant detriment. The combination of the Plourde '611 reference's with the Lingenfelter reference is thus incorrect, and the rejections of the claims must be overturned on this basis.

Further, the Examiner has misrepresented the relevance of In re Keller, which case in point of fact is not helpful to the Examiner's case. As stated in a more recent Federal Circuit case that cited In re Keller, "[t]he test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981) (and cases cited therein). In re Werner Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Since one skilled in the art would have no reason to combine the Plourde '611 reference with the Lingenfelter reference, Appellants submits that the Section 103(a) rejections must fall, and respectfully solicits the removal of the Section 103(a) rejections

of independent Claims 75, 96, 116, and 138, and the allowance of these claims as well as the claims depending therefrom.

IV. The Examiner's Arguments Regarding Combinations of References. In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner asserted that case law including particularly In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971) (from which the Examiner recites that "any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. . .") somehow justified the Examiner's clear use of impermissible hindsight in taking the elements of Appellants' claims and using them as a laundry list of constituents which the Examiner asserted (incorrectly) are found in two separate and unrelated references. The Examiner's Answer continues, stating that "the Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992)"

While these are fine words, unfortunately the Examiner's Answer merely recited them and then proceeded to completely ignore them. Neither in the April 22, 2005, Office Action nor in the Examiner's Answer is there a single word identifying any teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the cited references justifying the combination.

Further, it is clear that the Examiner did not even attempt to ascertain the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. It is telling that in both In re Fine and In re Jones, cases referenced in the Examiner's Answer, rejections of the claims were reversed for doing exactly what the Examiner has done in the April 22, 2005, Office Action -- failing to provide a teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine cited references.

When no teaching, suggestion, or motivation supporting a combination of references exists in the references that are being combined, and there is a complete absence of any finding related to the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, the rejection is exposed for what it is -- a completely unsupportable combination which is based entirely upon the use of hindsight on the part of the Examiner and the use of Appellants' claims by the Examiner as a blueprint to go and search for the elements of the claims -- a clearly inappropriate and impermissible use of hindsight knowledge. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

As the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit stated in Ecolochem, Inc. v. Southern California Edison Co. (227 F.3d 1361, 1371, 56 USPQ2d 1065, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 2000)), "the best defense against hindsight-based obviousness analysis is the rigorous

application of the requirement for a showing of a teaching or motivation to combine the prior art references." Appellants assert that the application of such a requirement in the present situation mandates a finding that there is no such teaching or motivation supporting the position taken by the Examiner, and respectfully solicits the removal of the Section 103(a) rejections of Claims 75, 96, 116, and 138, and the allowance of these claims as well as the claims depending therefrom.


Conclusions

1. The Examiner's Answer continued to mischaracterize the Plourde '611 reference, which fails to teach increasing the size of the opening in the Lingenfelter reference, and since the Section 103(a) rejection relies upon the Plourde '611 reference for this teaching as the basis upon which to combine the references, the rejection is accordingly deficient.
2. The Examiner's Answer failed to meet the well-established and clear requirements for combining references under Section 103(a), and the combinations of references made in the Section 103(a) rejections are based entirely on the impermissible use of hindsight, with the Examiner's knowledge of Appellants' claims and the use of that knowledge having provided a list of elements and limitations to search for in otherwise unrelated references.
3. The Examiner's Answer failed to respond to the arguments in Appellants' March 24, 2006, Appeal Brief that each of independent Claims 75, 96, 116, and 138 includes multiple limitations which are not taught or suggested by any of the cited prior art

references, either individually or in combination. Therefore, that argument stands as uncontroverted.

Accordingly, Appellants believe that the independent claims of the present application are drafted in a manner which clearly defines them over the prior art. As such, all of the dependant claims are believed to be patentable as well. Appellants believe that the invention as presently claimed is novel and nonobvious over the cited art as well as all other art of which Appellants are presently aware. Appellants accordingly respectfully request the removal of all rejections of pending Claims 75-116 and 138-153, and the allowance of the present application in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted:

By 
Leslie S. Miller
Attorney for Appellants
Registration No. 30,662

Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren s.c.
1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 298-8321

Customer No. 22922

Evidence Appendix




Fig. 5